1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT SEATTLE 9 MAURICE PATRICK. No. 2:12-cy-00702-RSM 10 Plaintiff. ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS 11 FOR LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER v. **JURISDICTION** 12 EMC MARKET OPINION AND RESEARCH SERVICES, INC., 13 Defendant. 14 15 16 **ORDER** 17 This Court has considered Defendant's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's claims for lack of 18 jurisdiction pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(1). See Dkt. #18. Plaintiff asserts subject matter 19 jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332. See Dkt. #7. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) confers upon 20 federal courts jurisdiction over "civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum 21 22 or value of \$10,000 . . . and is between . . . citizens of different States." For the exercise of 23 subject matter jurisdiction to be proper in a diversity case, no plaintiff can be a citizen of the 24 same state as any defendant. Owen Equipment & Erection Co. v. Kroger, 437 U.S. 365, 373 25 (1978). Diversity is determined as of the time the complaint was filed, Mann v. City of Tuscon, 26 782 F.2d 790, 794 (9th Cir. 1986), and the burden of proving jurisdictional facts is on the party

Case 2:12-cv-00702-RSM Document 22 Filed 08/07/12 Page 2 of 2

1	asserting jurisdiction, McNutt v. General Motors Acceptance Corp., 298 U.S. 178, 182; Fenton
2	v. Freedman, 748 F.2d 1358, 1359 n. 1 (9th Cir. 1984). The diversity statute is construed
3	strictly and doubts are resolved against finding jurisdiction. Kantor v. Wellesley Galleries, Ltd.,
4	704 F.2d 1088, 1092 (9th Cir. 1983).
5	Plaintiff asserts that he is a citizen of Washington. See Dkt. #1, Ex. 3. Defendant, a
6 7	corporation, is also a citizen of Washington. See Dkt. #19. See also 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1);
8	Industrial Tectonics Inc. v. Aero Alloy, 912 F.2d 1090, 1092 (9th Cir.1990) (holding that a
9	corporation is a citizen of the state in which it is incorporated and of the state in which it has its
10	principal place of business). Because the parties are not diverse, this court lacks subject matter
11	jurisdiction.
12	Now, therefore, it is hereby
13	ORDERED that all claims of Plaintiff, Maurice Patrick are dismissed in their entirety.
14	
15	DONE this 7 day of <u>August</u> 2012.
16	
17	
18	RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	